	1							
	2	CITY ATTORNEY Robert S. Maerz – 111796						
	3	Timothy B. McCormick – 130257 Airport General Counsel						
		San Francisco City Attorney's Office, Airport Div	vision					
		P.O. Box 8097 International Terminal, North Shoulder Building,	5th Floor					
	5	San Francisco, CA 94128-8097 Telephone: (650) 821-5088/ Facsimile: (650) 821-5086 e-mail: Timothy.McCormick@sfgov.org						
	6							
	7	WULFSBERG REESE COLVIG & FIRSTMAN PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION						
	8	H. James Wulfsberg – 046192						
	9	Timothy A. Colvig - 114723 Kris A. Cox - 136504						
	10	Kaiser Center 300 Lakeside Drive, 24th Floor						
	11	Oakland, CA 94612-3524 Telephone: (510) 835-9100						
		Facsimile: (510) 451-2170 e-mail: KAC@wulfslaw.com						
	13	Attorneys for Plaintiff						
-	14	City and County of San Francisco						
2 (212)	15	IINITED STATES I	DISTRICT COURT					
!								
	16	NORTHERN DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA					
		NORTHERN DISTRI						
	16	NORTHERN DISTRICTION SAN FRANCISCO,	CT OF CALIFORNIA					
	16 17	NORTHERN DISTRICATION SAN FRANCISCO, A California Municipal Corporation,	CT OF CALIFORNIA  SCO DIVISION  No. C 04-5307 PJH  STIPULATION TO F					
	16 17 18	NORTHERN DISTRICTION SAN FRANCIS CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, A California Municipal Corporation, Plaintiff,	CT OF CALIFORNIA SCO DIVISION No. C 04-5307 PJH					
	16 17 18 19	NORTHERN DISTRICTION SAN FRANCISCO SAN FRANCISCO, A California Municipal Corporation, Plaintiff, vs.	CT OF CALIFORNIA  SCO DIVISION  No. C 04-5307 PJH  STIPULATION TO H FOR FILING OF SU					
	16 17 18 19 20	NORTHERN DISTRICTION SAN FRANCIS CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, A California Municipal Corporation, Plaintiff, vs. FACTORY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY, a Rhode Island Corporation,	CT OF CALIFORNIA  SCO DIVISION  No. C 04-5307 PJH  STIPULATION TO H FOR FILING OF SU					
	16 17 18 19 20 21	NORTHERN DISTRICTION SAN FRANCIS CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, A California Municipal Corporation, Plaintiff, vs. FACTORY MUTUAL INSURANCE	CT OF CALIFORNIA  SCO DIVISION  No. C 04-5307 PJH  STIPULATION TO H FOR FILING OF SU					
	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	NORTHERN DISTRICTION  SAN FRANCIS  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, A California Municipal Corporation,  Plaintiff,  vs.  FACTORY MUTUAL INSURANCE  COMPANY, a Rhode Island Corporation, BOMBARDIER TRANSPORTATION	CT OF CALIFORNIA  SCO DIVISION  No. C 04-5307 PJH  STIPULATION TO H FOR FILING OF SU					
	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	NORTHERN DISTRICTION  SAN FRANCIS  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, A California Municipal Corporation,  Plaintiff,  vs.  FACTORY MUTUAL INSURANCE  COMPANY, a Rhode Island Corporation, BOMBARDIER TRANSPORTATION (HOLDINGS) USA, INC., a Delaware	CT OF CALIFORNIA  SCO DIVISION  No. C 04-5307 PJH  STIPULATION TO H FOR FILING OF SU					
	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	NORTHERN DISTRICTION  SAN FRANCIS  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, A California Municipal Corporation,  Plaintiff,  vs.  FACTORY MUTUAL INSURANCE  COMPANY, a Rhode Island Corporation, BOMBARDIER TRANSPORTATION (HOLDINGS) USA, INC., a Delaware Corporation,	CT OF CALIFORNIA  SCO DIVISION  No. C 04-5307 PJH  STIPULATION TO H FOR FILING OF SU					
	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	NORTHERN DISTRICTION SAN FRANCIS CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, A California Municipal Corporation, Plaintiff, vs.  FACTORY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY, a Rhode Island Corporation, BOMBARDIER TRANSPORTATION (HOLDINGS) USA, INC., a Delaware Corporation, Defendants.	CT OF CALIFORNIA  SCO DIVISION  No. C 04-5307 PJH  STIPULATION TO H FOR FILING OF SU					
	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	NORTHERN DISTRICTION SAN FRANCIS CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, A California Municipal Corporation, Plaintiff, vs.  FACTORY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY, a Rhode Island Corporation, BOMBARDIER TRANSPORTATION (HOLDINGS) USA, INC., a Delaware Corporation, Defendants.	CT OF CALIFORNIA  SCO DIVISION  No. C 04-5307 PJH  STIPULATION TO H FOR FILING OF SU					
	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	NORTHERN DISTRICTION SAN FRANCIS CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, A California Municipal Corporation, Plaintiff, vs.  FACTORY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY, a Rhode Island Corporation, BOMBARDIER TRANSPORTATION (HOLDINGS) USA, INC., a Delaware Corporation, Defendants.	CT OF CALIFORNIA  SCO DIVISION  No. C 04-5307 PJH  STIPULATION TO H FOR FILING OF SU					

STIPULATION TO EXTEND DEADLINES FOR FILING OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION AND REQUEST FOR ORDER 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

26

27

28

Plaintiff City and County of San Francisco ("CCSF"), Defendant Factory Mutual Insurance
Company ("FMIC") and Defendant and Counterclaimant Bombardier Transportation (Holdings)
USA, Inc. ("Bombardier") hereby stipulate as follows and request an Order as set forth below:

- At the hearing on March 15, 2006, before this Court, the Honorable Phyllis Hamilton 1. presiding, on Bombardier's Motion to Sever and CCSF and FMIC's Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment, this Court denied the Cross-Motions without prejudice, and denied the Motion to Sever. This Court further ordered:
  - a.) That the parties shall have until June 14, 2006, to engage in limited discovery on the issues raised in CCSF's and FMIC's Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment and in the Sixth Cause of Action in the Second Amended Complaint, in which CCSF seeks a declaration that Bombardier's recovery against CCSF, if any, cannot exceed any amount CCSF receives from FMIC under FMIC Policy No. UR 495; and
  - b.) That the parties shall file any motion for summary judgment relating to the issues/claims in 1(a) above only, no later than July 19, 2006, to be heard and briefed in accordance with the Civil Local Rules.
- 2. The parties have been diligently attempting to prepare a revised joint stipulation of undisputed facts as respects the issues set forth in the previous Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment. Counsel have been regularly meeting and conferring. CCSF and FMIC have also provided each other with substantial additional documentation and information relating to these issues and Bombardier has recently made additional information/documentation available. The parties are also actively seeking further information from third-parties. However, based upon a review of the documentation produced, the information provided, and the discussions among counsel as to the substance of the cross-motions for summary judgment, the parties share the opinion that they are unable to proceed with the filing of any summary judgment motions within the present schedule set by the Court as additional information and discovery from each other as well as from third parties is required. CCSF and Bombardier also have determined that the facts relevant to the issues presented by the cross-motions are more complex and involved than

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

12

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

previously presented and that a further inquiry into the negotiation and underwriting of the		
insurance policy at issue is required. Moreover, CCSF and Bombardier have determined that		
additional stipulated facts of a complicated and technical nature must be developed and agreed		
upon before any renewed cross-motion can be presented. Developing those facts will require		
significant additional analysis, investigation, and discovery.		

- 3. The parties understand that the Court's Order to open discovery was intended to provide Bombardier with the opportunity to evaluate its position on the issues and present that position in the anticipated motions, if desired, without prejudice to the other parties' right to object to Bombardier's standing to present its position on coverage issues. .
- 4. The parties have agreed to depose several (as many as ten) "person most knowledgeable" witnesses on these complex technical issues and insurance matters. The witnesses, many of whom are not currently affiliated with any party, primarily reside out of the state of California. Each witness will require significant preparation to be able to submit to a meaningful deposition. The parties anticipate that these limited depositions can be concluded by September 29, 2006.
- 5. The parties, therefore, stipulate to the following modification to the Court's March 17, 2006 Order, and respectfully request that the following Order be issued in lieu thereof:
  - a.) That the parties shall have until September 29, 2006, to engage in limited discovery on the two issues raised in CCSF's and FMIC's previous Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment, and on the issues raised by the Sixth Cause of Action in the Second Amended Complaint; and
  - b.) That any motion for summary judgment shall be filed no later than October 23, 2006, with a hearing date to be set by the court, in accordance with the Civil Local Rules, and that any such motions shall be limited to the issues raised in the previously-filed cross-motions, and/or to the issue as to whether Bombardier's recovery, if any, against CCSF should be limited to the amount of any recovery awarded to CCSF under the FMIC policy as set forth in the Sixth Cause of Action in the Second Amended Complaint.

## Case 4:04-cv-05307-PJH Document 71 Filed 07/10/06 Page 4 of 5

	1	6. Kris A. Cox, counsel for Plaintiff, hereby attests that he has on file all holograph signatures				
	2	for any signatures indicated by a "conformed" signature (/s/) within this e-filed document.				
	3	SO STIPULATED:				
	4					
	5					
	6 7	Dated: July 5, 2006	WULFSBERG, REESE COLVIG & FIRSTMAN PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION			
	8		By: /s/ Kris A. Cox Kris A. Cox			
	9		Attorneys for Plaintiff, City and County of San Francisco			
	10					
IAN	11					
IRSTIV t	12	Dated: July 5, 2006	CARLSON, CALLERDINE & PETERSON, LLP			
1 & F) TON LOOR 12-352/200	13		By: /s/ Joyce Wang			
LAW OFFICES  REESE COLVIG & FIRSTMAN OFESSIONAL CORPORATION KAISER CENTER AKESIDE DRIVE, 24TH FLOOR IND. CALIFORNIA 94612-3524 TELEPHONE (510) 835-9100	14		Joyce Wang Attorneys for Defendant Factory Mutual			
	15		Insurance Company			
SERG REE PROFESSI K. 300 LAKESI OAKLAND, C	16					
LAW ( ULFSBERG REESE PROFESSIONAI KAISER 300 LAKESIDE D OAKLAND, CALIF	17	Dated: July 5, 2006	SONNENSCHIEN NATH AND			
	18		ROSENTHAL LLP			
8	19		By:			
	20		By: /s/ Gayle M. Athanacio Gayle M. Athanacio Attorneys for Defendant Bombardier			
	21		Transportation (Holdings) USA, Inc.			
	22					
	23					
	24					
	25					
	26					
	27					
	28					

## Case 4:04-cv-05307-PJH Document 71 Filed 07/10/06 Page 5 of 5

	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
8	13
10) 835-91	14
EPHONE (5)	15
TELEPHO	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24

25

26

27

28

WULFSBERG REESE COLVIG & FIRSTMAN

LAW OFFICES

300 LAKESIDE DRIVE, 24TH FLOOR OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612-352/ 1

1.

The parties shall have until September 29, 200	6, to engage in limited discovery on the
issues raised previously in CCSF's and FMIC'	s Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment and

It is hereby ordered that the Court's Order of March 17, 2006, be modified so that:

on the issues raised by the Sixth Cause of Action in the Second Amended Complaint; and

25

Any motion for summary judgment shall be filed no later than October 29, 2006, and shall

2. Any motion for summary judgment shall be filed no later than October 29, 2006, and shall November 29, 2006
be noticed for hearing on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 2006, in accordance with the Civil Local Rules, and that the motion shall be limited to the issues raised in the previously-filed cross-motions and/or to the issue of the extent to which Bombardier's recovery, if any, against CCSF should be limited to the amount of any recovery awarded to CCSF under the FMIC policy as set forth in the Sixth Cause of Action in the Second Amended Complaint.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July <u>10</u>, 2006

